

REMARKS

This is in response to the Advisory Action of 14 October 2003. Claims 16-33 are pending in the application, Claims 16-26 have been rejected, and Claims 27-33 have been withdrawn from consideration.

The Advisory Action indicates that Applicant's amendment to Claim 26 has been entered. The Advisory Action further indicates that Applicant's arguments traversing the restriction requirement, and traversing the rejections have been considered, but did not place the application in condition for allowance.

By this amendment, withdrawn Claims 27-33 have been cancelled from this application, and independent Claim 16 has been amended, to more clearly set forth various aspects of the present invention.

No new matter has been added.

In view of the amendments above and remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination.

About The Invention

The present invention relates generally to electronic documents, and more particularly relates to production and display of electronic documents in which text and script portions are exclusive from each other (i.e., segregated), and in which the script portion includes location dependent parameter identifiers along with location coordinates, which, together, direct various effects of the script to the specified location. In one further aspect of the present invention, the script portion (which excludes text, and includes location parameters) directs replacement of one or more elements of the text portion with predetermined other elements. In another further aspect of the present invention, the script portion and text portion are communicated, or transmitted, separately.

Restriction Requirement

In the previous Office Action (13 August 2003), the Examiner made a

restriction requirement, stated that Applicant had made a constructive election of Claims 16-26, and indicated that Claims 27-33 were withdrawn from consideration. In response to that previous Office Action, Applicant presented arguments traversing the restriction requirement and withdrawal of Claims 27-33 from consideration. The Advisory Action of 14 October 2003 indicates that the Examiner has considered Applicant's arguments traversing the restriction requirement and the withdrawal from consideration of Claims 27-33; and, in view of that consideration, the Examiner has maintained the restriction requirement and withdrawal from consideration of Claims 27-33.

By this amendment, Applicant has cancelled withdrawn Claims 27-33. Applicant may pursue these Claims in a divisional application.

Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

In the previous Office Action (13 August 2003), Claims 16-26 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Freund, Jim ("HotDog Professional 5.1 Webmaster Suite: HotDog 5.1 Cuts the Mustard", 11/1998, Computer Shopper, Vol. 18, No. 11, pages 1-2) in view of Business Wire, "HotDog powers Web authors to new heights", 10/1996, pages 1-2), and in further view of Powers, et al., (US Patent 6,362,817). In response to that previous Office Action, Applicant presented arguments traversing the rejections of Claims 16-26. The Advisory Action of 14 October 2003 indicates that the Examiner has considered Applicant's arguments traversing the rejections under 35 USC 103(a), but has not found those arguments to be persuasive.

As set forth in greater detail below, although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the teachings of the cited references, Applicant has amended independent Claim 16 to more clearly set forth various aspects of the present invention.

Claims 16-33 are directed to various aspects of the present invention including providing separate text and script portions, each of those portions

being exclusive of the other; and the script portion including at least one location dependent parameter identifier. Prior art operators such as INPUT and TEXTAREA were in-line, or integrated with, the text portions upon which they operated. The segregated text portions can then be displayed by display applications, such as for example, text editors and email programs, that were not adapted to process the control information that script languages provide. Since the Claimed invention segregates such operators from the text to which they apply, it is necessary to modify the original scripts and introduce location coordinates therein so that a display application capable of interpreting the script commands can be provided with the information as to where in the text to apply the operation. Operators such as, but not limited to, INPUT and TEXTAREA are associated with location coordinates in the Claimed invention, and are referred to as location dependent parameter identifiers.

The Freund reference discloses an HTML editor and the display of a web page. The Business Wire reference discloses an HTML editor and the use of Java Script. Applicant respectfully asserts that neither reference, alone or in combination, produces the invention defined by the amended Claims, which require a text portion exclusive of script, a script portion exclusive of text, the script portion further including location dependent parameter identifiers, and wherein the text and script portions are provided in a manner such that when presented to an application that lacks a capability to interpret or process the script commands, the text portion, unaffected by the script commands, is displayed. Such a display is in an easy to read format, unencumbered by integrated script commands. There does not appear to be any motivation in these references to produce Applicant's claimed invention. Both Freund and Business Wire disclosures are provided in the context of an HTML editor. Applicant's invention addresses the problems faced by application programs such as e-mail programs or text processors, which were designed for text messages, and not for the processing of control messages such as scripts. In other words, an HTML editor inherently does not have the problem which Applicant's claimed invention solves. Therefore it is understandable why the articles about HTML editors do not provide motivation for Applicant's claimed invention.

By this amendment, independent Claim 16 has been amended to make clear that an electronic document is produced which, when the first text portion and the first script portion are provided to an application that lacks a capability for formatting the first text portion in accordance with the first script portion, results in the display of the first text portion. Support for this amendment can be found generally throughout the specification, and can be more particularly found at page 4 of the specification.


Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to independent Claim 16 overcomes the rejection under 35 USC 103(a). Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 17-26, which depend directly or indirectly from amended Claim 16, are also unobvious in view of the cited references.

Conclusion

All of the rejections in the Office Action of 13 August 2003 and the Advisory Action of 14 October have been responded to, and Applicant respectfully submits that the pending Claims 16-26 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Raymond J. Werner
Reg. No. 34,752

Dated: 13 November 2003
Portland, Oregon